

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing, re-examination and reconsideration of the subject matter identified in caption, pursuant to and consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.116, and in light of the remarks which follow, are respectfully requested.

By the present amendment, claims 1, 7, 8, 12, 16-20, 24-28, 31, 32 and 37-39 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and to expedite prosecution of this application. Claim 21 has been rewritten in independent form and is directed to compositions wherein the nanolatex or nano particle polymer is specific to polymer (P3) which is amphoteric. Claims 2, 4-6, 9-11 and 13-15 are now dependent upon claim 21. Process claims 29 and 30 are directed to a preferred feature of the invention, i.e., compositions which impart crease-resistance to fabrics and/or facilitate ironing of fabrics. Claims 2-6, 9-11, 13-15, 21-23, 29, 30, 33-36 and 40 will be pending in this application upon entry of these amendments. No new issues have been raised since the present Amendment merely rewrites rejected claim 21 in independent form.

The objection to claim 32 for the reason given in paragraph (8) of the Office Action and the rejection of claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reason given in paragraph (12) of the Office Action have been obviated by cancellation of these claims.

The objection to claim 6 and the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for reasons given in paragraphs (16) and (18) of the Office Action have been

obviated by the present amendment. Accordingly, the objection and §112 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 5-29 and 33-40 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by WO 98/00449 to Sharma et al. for the reasons set forth on page 7 of the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and for at least the following reasons.

The currently amended claims are directed to a textile-treating composition containing a nanolatex or nanoparticles of an insoluble polymer identified as (P3) and being derived from at least 70 wt. % hydrophobic monomer units identified as (N) and from 0.1 to about 30 wt. % of an amphoteric monomer unit identified as (F2). Also claimed is a method of imparting crease-resistant properties and/or facilitating ironing of fabrics treated with the aforementioned nanolatex or nanoparticles.

Sharma et al '449 fails as an anticipation because the document does not disclose or suggest a composition or method as currently claimed. There is no teaching therein of polymers prepared from amphoteric monomers or the treatment of textiles to provide crease-resistance and/or facilitate ironing thereof.

Accordingly, in view of the above, the §102(b) rejection over Sharma et al. '449 should be withdrawn and such action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,746,455 to Matsuda et al. for reasons given on pages 7-8 of the Office

Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are requested for at least the reasons which follow.

Clams 1 and 31 have been canceled. Claims 2, 4 and 30 are now dependent upon claim 21. Since claim 21 was not rejected over Matsuda et al. '455, it is clear that the §102(b) rejection based on this reference is inapplicable to the present claims and should be withdrawn.

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is believed to be next in order and such action is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions concerning this paper or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 838-6683 at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: December 19, 2003

By: George F. Lesmes
George F. Lesmes
Registration No. 19,995

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620